Out of Due Time
Roman Catholic Modernism

Gerard Loughlin
Durham University

Roman Catholic modernism was of its time. As a movement of thought it bespoke the concerns of nineteenth-century thinkers with the challenge that historical awareness posed to the seeming certainties of the Christian faith. But just insofar as it looked to change Christian thought it bespoke a time to come, a future that had already arrived for some but which needed to arrive more securely and for all. As such it came to haunt twentieth-century Catholicism, both as a path rejected and as a path still to be taken. Catholic modernism shadows Fergus Kerr's history of *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians* (2007), that is otherwise structured by the fate of neoscholasticism.[1]

Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (1879), had encouraged the church to embrace the "solid doctrine of the Fathers and the Scholastics", and above all the teaching of Thomas Aquinas, as alone best suited for resisting the "machinations and craft of a certain false wisdom", the "plague of perverse opinions" assailing "domestic and civil society".[2] Scholastic philosophy would teach the meaning of liberty as distinct from license, respect for authority and the "just rule of princes", and bring "sound judgment and right method" to the arts, and "force and light" to the "physical sciences".[3] And when Pope Pius X came to condemn the teachings of the modernists, in his encyclical *Pascendi Dominici Gregis* (1907), he opposed them to the teachings of scholasticism, dislike for which is the sure sign of a modernist.[4]

Neoscholastic philosophy, as taught in the seminaries of the Catholic Church, was the one reliable bulwark against the falsehoods of modernity. Fergus Kerr's twentieth-century story narrates the collapse of that defence, perhaps from the encroachments of modernity, but also from the retrieval of an

earlier scholasticism, a rereading of Thomas that pitched him against the philosophical system propounded in his name. But our concern is with the modernism to which Pius X opposed his understanding of the Angelic Doctor.[5] For it is one of many ironies, that those condemned as modernists could see themselves as faithful Thomists. Indeed George Tyrrell—who was one of the most prominent modernists in his day—could write that when he taught at St Mary's Hall, Stonyhurst (1894-96), he was perceived as "favouring the Pope's ultra-Thomism". But his partiality was subversive. "If the Dominicans knew what my Thomism meant, they would burn me at a slow fire." Tyrrell would study Thomas as he would study Dante, "in order that knowing the mind of another age we might know the mind of our own more intelligently". His hope was to "use the neoscholastic movement to defeat the narrow spirit which animates many of its promoters"; to introduce what might otherwise seem "alien" thought "under cover of Aquinas".[6]

The story of modernism is not exactly that of two rival Thomisms, though it is that. On the one hand, a finely honed system that sought to establish the rationality of theism, Christianity, and finally Catholicism and the authority of the pope, who had become infallible in 1870. On the other hand, a spirituality that was above all impressed with the unknowability of that which it yet named God, the source and goal of all life, and who in Jesus had come to us so that we might reach our goal, in the company of the saints. But it is also the story of when modernity arrived in the Church, perhaps not for the first time, nor the last, but a time when a number of talented Catholics sought to understand their faith in such a way that they could find eternity in an otherwise disenchanted world, a history and nature that had come to seem radically contingent yet comprehensible—and controllable—through sciences that had no need of divinity. It was the arrival of the world in which many of us still live.

Making Modernism

It is often said that Catholic modernism is the construct of those who opposed it, brought into being by its avowed enemies. Modernism is the child of

Pascendi, a phantom of papal rhetoric.[7] Issued on 8 September 1907, this encyclical was a robust and lengthy condemnation of modernism. Addressed to the bishops of the Catholic Church by Pius X, its greater part was probably penned by Fr Joseph Lemius (1860-1923), a curial theologian with a passion for distilling and destroying the modernist system.[8] The pope, however, set the tone. Scathing in its denunciations, and sarcastic in its descriptions, *Pascendi* often descends to insult, and the use, as it itself admits, of uncouth or "unwonted terms".[9] Modernism is a perversion of the mind that springs from curiosity, pride and ignorance, but chiefly pride.[10] It is to be defeated by rooting out all infected parties from seminaries and Catholic universities, where many have created "chairs of pestilence",[11] and through careful censorship and the setting up of "councils of vigilance" in all dioceses.[12] But the most effective remedy was prescribed after *Pascendi*, on 1 September 1910, in the form of an anti-modernist oath to be taken by all priests and anyone else who might be enjoined to do so.[13]

No modernists are named in *Pascendi*, none of their texts cited. But earlier, on 17 July 1907, the Holy Office had issued a decree, *Lamentabili sane*, that listed and condemned a number of propositions taken from unnamed modernist writings. But no one person propounded the views ascribed to modernism as a whole; indeed that there was a movement at all is something like wishful or fearful thinking. It was as if the defenders of scholasticism needed to imagine themselves opposed by a system every bit as comprehensive as their own; by, in fact, the "synthesis of all heresies."[14] Only something this grand could justify the ferocity of attack and severity of defence. Indeed, Alfred Loisy—the leading French modernist—was to make very much this argument in his *Simples réflextions* (1908).[15] And *Pascendi* admits that the system it attacks has had to be constructed, since "it is one of the cleverest devices of the modernists (as they are commonly and rightly called) to present their doctrines without order and systematic arrangement, in a scattered and disjointed manner, so as to make it appear as if their minds were in doubt or hesitation, whereas in reality they are quite fixed and steadfast."[16]

The infection that *Pascendi* seeks to overcome, the enemy it wants to rout, has a "manifold personality; he is a philosopher, a believer, a theologian, an historian, a critic, an apologist, a reformer."[17] But first and last he is a

philosopher. He is agnostic about the human capacity to know God, yet also discerns a "vital immanence". God is found within the subconscious, though obscurely.[18] But this sense is the basis of religion, indiscriminately considered: "that most absurd tenet of the Modernists, that every religion, according to the different aspect under which it is viewed, must be considered as both natural and supernatural."[19] The unknown is given in the known, so transfiguring the latter. But this is also a disfiguring, because faith is needed to see what is otherwise not evident, and this is particularly so of Christ.[20] And then the intellect steps in, transforming the sense of the divine into symbols and dogmas, which are thus secondary, not primary. They are mere instruments, and given to evolving, to changing with the times.[21] *Pascendi* then shows how these ideas are worked out in the other aspects of the modernist "personality", as believer, etc.. The encyclical is most incensed by the appeal to experience as the basis of religion, when the latter should be understood as a matter of recognition and deduction from given facts. It is affronted by the secondariness of theological judgement and church pronouncement, and the supposed "evolution" of the latter. On the contrary, what was once given is good for all time.[22] Finally, *Pascendi* finds modernist immanentism to be no more than pantheism, and indicates the road that leads from Protestantism, via modernism to atheism.[23]

Pascendi is never less than vigorous, and almost plausible in the system it sketches. Knowing the work of the modernists one can see the tendencies it has crystallized, which contain lines of thought that stretch far into twentieth-century theology, Catholic and Protestant. But knowing the modernists a little better, one also realizes how wide of the mark it is, as well as constantly wondering why it finds the problems it does. But above all, one realizes that it is never less than a diatribe, that it lacks any sense of the problems with which its opponents are struggling, and that they are genuine problems requiring real struggle. *Pascendi* is devastating, but it is not serious. It is the work of men who have ceased to think, let alone be puzzled by the mystery of the world.

But it is the anti-modernist oath that perhaps gives the clearest indication of what really concerned Pius and his collaborators, a concern they could not otherwise articulate. The oath makes five chief professions, of which the fifth is that "faith is not a blind feeling of religion welling up from the recesses of the

subconscious," but an assent of the intellect to proffered truths.[24] But from where do such truths come, and how are they known to be true? The first profession is that God is known by reason through his effects; the second that Christianity is proved from such as "miracles and prophecies"; and the third that the Church "was immediately and directly instituted by the real and historical Christ", with fourthly, it's teaching given always "the same meaning and interpretation".[25] Here reason has the first place, and it leads from God to the papacy, the teaching of which is invariant and beyond question, except that modernism did question. The papal, neoscholastic argument, as set out in the oath, is more than weak, and the pointing out of this a cause for almost limitless anxiety.

Modernism was well established by the time it was condemned, with a number of proponents, clerical and lay, throughout Europe and in the United States of America.[26] But it was not a movement that anyone sat down to invent. Its agenda was emergent rather than drawn-up, evolving rather than planned, responding to events rather than instigating them, and it was non-simultaneous. It was not everywhere the same at the same time, and all involved—some of whom were self-proclaimed modernists while others had the name thrust upon them—grew, fluctuated, and even declined in the nature and intensity of their modernity. For many it was but a further development of what was recognized as liberal Catholicism, a movement of thought and sensibility that sought to reconcile Catholicism with the modern sciences of history and nature, and with democracy. The last point should not be overlooked. All the modernists were at home in political cultures that to one degree or another had enfranchised their (male) citizens and relativized the power of the Church. They looked for the same freedom of thought, of conscience and expression, in the Church as they enjoyed in civil society. But Rome was still at odds with the political order that, in the wake of Napoleon, had emerged in the nineteenth century; with France's Third Republic (beginning in 1871), and with—above all—the final loss of the Papal State in 1870.[27] These developments were not other than traumatic for the papacy, with the most hysterical reaction being Pius IX's orchestration of "his own infallibility".[28] But while this last produced much agonizing in the Church, it fooled no one, and the Church's loss of power continued apace, even as its claims

to authority grew more strident. Thus modernism—and its destruction—became almost inevitable, since its overcoming reaffirmed the identity of a Church that was now dependent on just such defeats.

But the modernists themselves sought a different identity for the Church, believing that she had to change with the times in order to remain the same: the bearer and sustainer of a spiritual truth that exceeded the form in which it arrived and was nurtured. Thus the modernists contended with developments in the historical criticism of the Bible, advanced alternative philosophical frameworks to what they saw as a moribund scholasticism, and argued for a spirituality that while most truly named in Catholicism—in its doctrines of Trinity and Christ—was yet more universal in its effects than the reach of the Church. The underlying attitude of this approach was well summed up by Wilfred Ward when he wrote of it as an attempt to "present Catholic doctrine in such a form as to make it clearly consistent with the scientific researches of the day, and to attract the deeper religious thinkers … who are looking for truth and would not see it in ancient forms of thought and expression quite incomprehensible to them."

> I considered this endeavour to be exactly that of St Thomas in the 13th century, when, though censured by many for the novelty of his method, he translated Catholic theology into the dialectical form which the intellectual habit of the day demanded, and assimilated it to the philosophy of Aristotle which, though the Fathers had denounced it, had gained such a hold on the western intellect in the 13th century.[29]

Ward was writing at the end of 1909, but describing what he had believed fifteen years previously, when he had first become acquainted with a nascent modernism, and with the work of George Tyrrell in particular. In the intervening years, however, the modernists had gained their name, and moved away from what Ward recognized as his own liberal Catholicism. Modernism had become the name of those who, starting out with the best of intentions, had come to privilege their own judgement above that of the Church's due authorities, and so had become uncatholic. If Ward had ever thought himself a modernist, he would

not have done so after 1907 and the moment of crisis. One might think him modernist-lite.[30]

Loisy, five of whose books had been placed on the Index of Forbidden Books in 1903, was excommunicated in 1908. He did not seek reconciliation. But George Tyrrell's break with the Church was the most tragic. He had converted to Catholicism in 1879, and become a Jesuit priest in 1891; fourteen years later he was expelled from the Order in February 1905. In 1907 he published two articles against *Pascendi* and was excommunicated. And two years after that, on 15 July 1909, he died from Brights disease.[31] Having been unable to recant his views, he was denied a Catholic burial, and the priest—Tyrrell's old friend, Henri Bremond—who presumed to say prayers at the graveside, was reprimanded and later required to take the oath against modernism.[32] (For some, sacraments and rites become political; not the means of God's grace but the measure of men's displeasure.) But other modernists escaped discipline. Friedrich von Hügel—the modernists' *éminence grise*—always wrote more cautiously than those whom he tutored in thinking differently, and he was a layman.[33] Yet others—for example Edouard Le Roy and Lucien Laberthonnière (a priest)—had books placed on the Index, but were not otherwise punished. And Maude Petre (1863-1942), who loved Tyrrell and fostered his life and writings, and wrote his biography, was for a time denied the sacraments in her own diocese, but received elsewhere. But of more concern than the fate of individuals, was the state of paranoia that gripped the Church, as if it had become a police state in which the wrong thoughts, unwisely or foolishly spoken, would lead to delation, condemnation, expulsion.[34] Maisie Ward complained that Maude Petre's writings on modernism were melancholic, "instinct with sorrow";[35] but then Tyrrell's death almost slips out of sight in Ward's account. The story of modernism is a sad one.

Maisie Ward was the doting eldest daughter of Wilfred Ward (1856-1916), and he and his wife Josephine (née Hope-Scott, 1864-1932), were at the heart of upper class English Catholic life and culture. Having given up thoughts of opera, Wilfred's career was that of a gentleman "liaison officer" between Catholicism and wider society.[36] More substantially, he was a biographer of Catholic lives, most notably of his own father, William George Ward—a Newmanite who with his wife converted to Catholicism in 1845, the first of the

Tractarians to do so—then of Cardinal Wiseman, and finally of Cardinal Newman.[37] In 1906 Wilfred took over the editorship of *The Dublin Review*, which had previously been edited by his father.[38]

Josephine Ward was the second of three daughters—'bad, worser and worst'[39]—born to James Hope-Scott and his second wife, Victoria Howard. James was a Scott through his first marriage to the granddaughter of Sir Walter Scott, from whom he also took the Scott family home of Abbotsford, where Josephine spent the first years of her life. James' second wife, and Josephine's mother, was the daughter of the Duke of Norfolk. Thus Wilfred, a second-generation Catholic, married into one of the country's most illustrious recusant families. While Wilfred was a biographer and journalist, his wife was a novelist—writing as Mrs Wilfred Ward.[40] The author of some thirteen books, she told the story of modernism in her novel, *Out of Due Time* (1906).

The Story of Modernism

Mrs Ward's novel is not often mentioned in discussions of modernism. Alec Vidler referred to it in his study of *A Variety of Catholic Modernists* (1970), but in such a way as to suggest that it had not been read.[41] But for modernism the *roman à clef* was a natural form. All the modernists were prolific writers, producing books and articles, signed and anonymous, and commenting on them—their own and others—in copious letters and missives, and so constructing and reconstructing the story in which they were all players.[42] It is certainly the case that *Out of Due Time* is the way in which Mrs Ward entered into the story in which her husband was an important, though not a leading character. But it is not possible to distinguish her position from his, nor theirs from that of their daughter, Maisie, who got to tell the final version of the tale.[43] The novel enabled the Wards to say in public what otherwise was only privately available.

Out of Due Time is the story of a small group of Catholic friends, who, enthused with the latest results of biblical criticism set out to inform and reform the Church, and meeting resistance, work to convert Rome so that all will be

converted. Theirs is a passion for the faith and for learning. Early readers knew that the novel was about the modernists, though Mrs Ward would only admit to it being based on the story of the priest Félicité de Lamennais (1782-1854), the founder of French liberal Catholicism.[44] Lamennais both defended the Catholic faith—arguing for it on the basis of the *sensus communis*, the necessity and rationality of believing in what is commonly known—and democracy. Through the newspaper *L'Avenir* (*The Future*), he argued for such policies as the separation of church and state, and the legitimacy of civil rights, such as freedom of the press. The paper's motto was "God and Liberty". Condemned by the French episcopacy, who prohibited sales of the paper, Lamennais and his friends—Henri-Dominique Lacordaire and Charles de Montalembert—appealed to Rome, where they arrived in December 1831 after a month's journey. They were granted an audience with Pope Gregory XVI in March of the following year, but to little effect.[45] In July Lamennais left Rome for Munich, where he received a copy of the encyclical *Mirari vos* (15 August 1832), which ruled out the Church's embrace of liberty, condemning freedom of conscience and of the press. There was to be no separation of church and state; no equality of religions under the state—the power of which did not come from the people. As a result, though not immediately, Lamennais was to abandon Catholicism, and eventually died without the comforts of the church in 1854.[46] He was buried without religious ceremony in Père Lachaise in Paris. In 1864 his *Essai sur l'indifférence en matière de religion* (1817-23) was listed in Pius IX's *syllabus errorum*, and it was formally condemned at the Vatican Council in 1870.

Mrs Wilfred Ward's novel tells a similar tale. Her Lamennais also combines liberal views with papal commitment. When his publication—*The Catholic International Review*[47]—is threatened with closure he too travels with friends to Rome, is kept waiting for an inconclusive audience with the pope, only to learn later that his ideas have been condemned. Disillusioned, he leaves the Church. But Mrs Ward's Lamennais is more concerned with reconciling exegetical and theological matters than political and civil ones, and her hero or anti-hero is Count Paul d'Etranges. Though Mrs Ward denied that he was based on Baron von Hügel,[48] the identification seems obvious. Most readers assumed parallels between her characters and her and her husband's friends and

acquaintances. “How incredibly remote these unhappy things now seem”, Fr C. C. Martindale wrote to her twenty years after the novel’s publication. “And how quite possibly the very dear and venerated Baron [von Hügel] did just spoil his possibly vast career by a few flaws somewhere or other in his make-up—of course, I am not taking d’E[tranges] as a full portrait; but it has made me re-reflect upon my memories of him.”[49]

The story of the liberal Catholic turned modernist, Paul d’Etranges, is told from the point of view of a steadfast liberal, Lisa Fairfax, who is in fact Mrs Ward herself. Indeed, the young Lisa expresses something of Josephine’s own pre-marital trepidations;[50] but then Lisa meets George Sutcliffe, the author of articles in *The Nineteenth Century*, and with whom she slowly falls in love and eventually marries. George is Wilfred. But before Lisa realizes where her true affections and intellectual sympathies lie, she fancies that she and the Count should be united in matrimony as well as in “the cause”—which is best explained to her and the reader by Sutcliffe.

> It is, as far as I can make out, the reform of the intellectual condition of the Church Catholic and Universal. I smell something of Christian Socialism in the business, which is not much in my line, but it is what attracts his sister. He [d’Etranges] regards Catholicism as the one hope for religion and order in the future—as the one effective defence against infidelity and anarchism. But the Church cannot triumph unless it assimilates modern science, and keeps its hold on the people. It must be scientific and democratic. One of the first articles of the Count’s creed is death to Scholasticism, and there I’m partly with him. He is to bring the seminaries up to date in historical criticism, and there I say “chi va piano, va sano” [he who goes softly, goes safely], for after all it is a science in its infancy. … He knows so little of human nature; he has no philosophy of action, he leaves everything to ideas. Teach the young priests philosophy up to date, shake the Vatican like a bottle of medicine till you get the right things at the top, and you will have a Catholic church made in Germany, and fit, according to him, to guide and to embody the thought of the human race.[51]

The Count, like the Baron, carries on an "immense correspondence" with people on the continent.[52] And like the Baron—or so the Wards believed—d'Etranges has no doubt as to the rightness of the cause and will use any means to further his ends. As Sutcliffe remarks with disgust, the Count employs "unprincipled journalists" and "will hobnob with intriguers", one of whom is "a seedy American who lives in Rome to make mischief or money, and the other is the journalist who publishes the same mischief to enlighten the British public."[53] The Baron did encourage non-Catholics to write to the press and publish articles criticizing the Church when he felt that it was not safe for him or other Catholics to do so. He would often dictate the pieces that appeared under the names of others.[54]

Lisa is drawn to the Count through copying out articles for him. In this way she learns his theology, and that finally she herself is not heterodox and doesn't love him after all. Her future is with Sutcliffe and moderation. They are Catholics at the end of the day, while the Count, by the end of the novel, has moved beyond Catholicism—and here he is perhaps more Lamennais than von Hügel—which is but the expression of the universal religion, given in humanity.[55] The Catholic Church "gathers and preserves … the imperishable fragments of holiness in human history."[56]

While the men are writing theology, Lisa plays her part by writing fiction; as Josephine writes *Out of Due Time*. The latter is Lisa's book. The novel suggests that the modernist flaw was one of intellectual arrogance. Its proponents were overly intellectual, and overly convinced of their righteousness. This drove them to the edge and beyond. It is said of the Count, that he does not have "the religion that men should die in, the religion of the heart".[57] He is too intemperate and cannot wait upon the times. He acts *too soon*. But those who can wait—and Rome can wait—may yet see realized what at present seems impossible. As many have thought, the modernists had only to wait for the second Vatican Council (1962-65); though for some the latter also arrived too soon.

At the end of Ward's novel, after the cause has failed, and Sutcliffe and d'Etranges have gone their separate ways, the time moves forward fifteen years, and George and Lisa return to Rome, where they find—much to their and the

reader's surprise—that the Count has returned to the Church and become a Dominican. He is preaching in the church of Santa Maria sopra Minerva, and he appends a concluding statement to the novel, in which he aptly quotes from Newman's *Apologia Pro Vita Sua*.

> There is a time for everything, and many a man desires a reformation of an abuse, or the fuller developments of a doctrine, or the adoption of a particular policy, but forgets to ask himself whether the right time for it has come; and, knowing that there is no one who will be doing anything towards its accomplishment in his own lifetime unless he does it himself, he will not listen to the voice of authority, and he spoils a good work in his own century, in order that an other man, as yet unborn, may not have the opportunity of bringing it happily to perfection in the next. … And all those who take the part of that ruling authority will be considered as time-servers or indifferent to the cause of uprightness and truth; while, on the other hand, the said authority may be accidentally supported by a violent ultra party which exalts opinions into dogmas, and has it principally at heart to destroy every school of thought but its own.[58]

History

Count Paul d'Etranges comes to grief through espousing the "higher criticism", through finding the Bible erroneous (in parts) and *saying this*. The nineteenth century saw the development of historical science, of an approach to the past that judged its remains—artifacts and chronicles—by standards of reason that were newly confident of the world's lawful working, and in the progress of human endeavour and understanding. This approach to the past was not new in the nineteenth century. It was the gift of the Enlightenment, with David Hume its most devastating exponent.[59] But the nineteenth century saw its ever more exact development; an exquisite refinement of tools for the sifting of fact from fantasy, of the likely from the legendary, the credible from the unacceptable. This was especially an achievement of biblical historiography, first

in England and then in Germany, and then in England again, as elsewhere on the continent.[60] As such, this was very much a story of Protestant engagement, but towards the end of the nineteenth century it became a Catholic one also, and the modernists were very much involved in bringing these concerns home to the Catholic Church, with reaching an accommodation between faith and the questioning of its once seemingly impregnable support: a self-evidently veridical scripture. The most distinguished writer in this regard was Alfred Loisy (1857-1940).

Loisy was exemplary in the clarity with which he argued for the separation of history from theology. The first is considered apart from faith, by an impartial reason that answers only to the way the world is seen to go, and verified as going.

> There was the historical sense of the texts and their traditional one; the first appertaining to them in virtue of their origin and true nature, the second that which has been grafted on to them by the work of faith in the later evolution of Judaism and Christianity. For the critical historian only the first is to be considered as the meaning of the biblical text; the second regards the history of exegesis and belief.[61]

At the time, the challenge posed by this separation of a primary historical sense from a secondary theological interpretation was focused in the question of inspiration, made unavoidable for Catholic thinkers by the encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* (1893). This asserted the divine authorship of holy scripture, which is inspired in all its parts and thus free from error.[62] Moreover, this teaching was expressly aimed against practitioners of the "higher criticism",[63] though at the same time the encyclical called for the support of such scholarship as would serve to show the but seeming nature of scripture's purported errors.[64] The encyclical could thus be read as either defending the inerrancy of scripture in all its parts or the need for scripture's careful interpretation so as to preserve its inspired status. Thus the letter itself became the site of contested interpretations, arguing for and against the freedom for historical criticism in the Catholic Church.[65]

Loisy wrote on many topics, but he began as a biblical scholar, his first book on the Old Testament appearing in 1890, with a second on the New Testament in 1891. Two more quickly followed in 1893 and 1894. But the book that brought him most attention was *L'Évangile et l'Église* (1902), the "classical exposition of Catholic Modernism", as Tyrrell was to state.[66] The book was presented as a Catholic response to Adolf von Harnack's recently published and widely read, *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1900), a book that would become a classic statement of Liberal Protestantism: Jesus came to proclaim the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, the arrival of the kingdom in the heart of the individual.[67] This, for Harnack, was the historical kernel of the Christian faith, and all else was husk, to be discarded. Against this, Loisy insisted on the necessity of tradition, as that which carried and so constituted the story of Jesus. However the truth of Christianity may be summed, it will be found in the whole rather than in one part; it will be found in the faith of those who responded, rather than in the facts descried by the historian. Faith responds to the coming of Christ and his church, the history in which faith lives and flourishes. Dogma is not given entire at the first, but grows and develops in order that the truth of Jesus may arrive in the changing contexts that history brings. Here Loisy, like other modernists, could look back to John Henry Newman and his *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (1845, 1878), as having opened the way to what the modernists were now attempting, though with a greater sense of the gap between the scriptural testimony and its doctrinal development than Newman could have envisaged.[68] The Cardinal had enthused many of the modernists, and his prestige was such that they were only too happy to claim lineage, though others—such as Wilfred Ward—feared that Newman's name would be tarnished by its association with them; that Newman's idea of development would be thought condemned by *Pascendi*, as indeed Tyrrell was to argue.[69]

While *L'Évangile et l'Église* was welcomed by many, including a cautious Cardinal Sarto, who later became pope Pius X,[70] others perceived that though it attacked Harnack, it defended his historicism. For Loisy there was no abiding core to Christianity that somehow escaped the vicissitudes of history. There was but the history of the church's survival; a continuing but changing form of faith. Cardinal Richard of Paris condemned the book in January 1903, and in the autumn of that year Loisy published an *Autour d'un petit livre* in which he sought to clarify his thought.

But rather than conciliate, it exacerbated by even more clearly insisting on the distinction between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith. Jesus had no consciousness of being what later faith recognized, and that recognition was revelation. "La révélation se réalise dans l'homme, mais elle est l'oeuvre de Dieu en lui, avec lui et par lui."[71] And likewise, the founding of the church and her sacraments was a matter of faith rather than history. These views may now seem uncontroversial, so commonplace did they become in the twentieth century, but in Loisy's day they were seen as an attack on the authority of the church, which claimed a self-evident foundation, secure from the vagaries of belief. By the end of 1903, with Pius X having succeeded Leo XIII, five of Loisy's books were placed on the index of prohibited books. While Loisy submitted to this judgment he could not recant his views. He gave up his lectureship at the École des Hautes Études, and devoted himself to further historical work on the gospels. In 1908 he was formally excommunicated, and in 1909 he became a professor at the Collège de France.

In Loisy, modernism had its sharpest exponent of the historical criticism that had already challenged Protestant faith in the nineteenth century, and would challenge Catholic belief in the twentieth. The issues would be constantly revisited in the Protestant traditions throughout the twentieth century, and increasingly encountered in Catholicism after the second Vatican Council. It was the Church's response to such as Loisy that delayed the Catholic encounter with the challenges of history. There would be repeated attempts to close the gap between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, and to find the former but the projection of a secular belief.[72] But such attempts, despite their legitimacy and success, cannot overcome the historicizing of knowledge that the nineteenth century brought, and modernism focused. George Tyrrell's now famous remark—"The Christ that Harnack sees, looking back through nineteen centuries of Catholic darkness, is only the reflection of a Liberal Protestant face, seen at the bottom of a deep well"[73]—articulates the relativity that affects both the positivists, who would evade contingency, and their opponents, who seek to triumph through its acknowledgement.[74]

Philosophy

Modernism was very much concerned with persuading the Catholic Church that it needed to acknowledge and accommodate the disquietude that a historical sensibility brings to knowledge.[75] Texts have to be interpreted, and are interpreted in the very act of reading. And the texts interpreted are themselves interpretations, ventures upon realities that are only brought to light in the venturing. Facts are found through fiction, through the inventing that is their discovery. Put another way, the modernist challenge was for faith to be *faith*. Faith gives rise to facts, not facts to faith. The Church had to take responsibility for its reading of scripture. Likewise, it had to take responsibility for its reading of nature, and its fashioning of reason.

Neoscholasticism, however, sought to evade faith by establishing it upon certain knowledge, given in scripture and nature through reason. It was possible to establish the existence of God through reason, and from there build arguments for the veracity of scripture and the authority of the church. *Pascendi*, as we have seen, ridiculed what it saw as the modernist attempt to found religion on an appeal to experience, to the idea that a sense of the supernatural is given in the natural. It criticized this as subjective, equating revelation with consciousness (or subconsciousness), and as pantheistic, equating the world with God. But those whose teaching might have been read in this way, took great care to stress the interrelationship between what is seen and the one who sees—so that knowledge emerges from the movement between the two—and even more care to establish that what is immanent in nature is that which transcends it, and immanent because it is transcendent.

This more philosophical modernism is normally found in the writings of Maurice Blondel (1861-1949), Lucien Laberthonnière (1860-1932), and Edouard Le Roy (1870-1954).[76] Blondel is the most important of these, but his inclusion among the modernists is sometimes questioned.[77] Having avoided censure, later writers would claim him as a source for orthodox *ressourcement*, and, as with Newman, seek to deny any taint of heterodoxy; while others saw him and Newman as forebears of their own revisionism. And others simply failed to see the requisite modernity in his writings. Blondel, according to Robert Dell, had a

"regular ecclesiastical mind",[78] and not only did he escape censure, he willingly submitted to papal authority and only privately lamented what befell others. "If he had been a modernist, he would have been an agonizing, but not a courageous one."[79]

Blondel criticized Loisy, occasioning a rebuke from von Hügel.[80] But like Loisy, Blondel's own immanentist philosophy was set against what he saw as the "extrinsicism" of the neoscholastics, that argued from facts—whether of nature or scripture—extracted from their contexts, attending to their extrinsic or imbued character, rather than to their intrinsic meaning.[81] But he also opposed what he named "historicism", an appeal to history that hid the interpretive lenses by which that history was brought into view; that set a gulf between fact and interpretation, ignoring the dependency of the former on the latter.[82] Against both, Blondel set an account of "tradition" as the happy synthesis of history and dogma. Tradition is not a mere matter of transmitting the past to the present, or of reading the present into the past, but of discovering and formulating "truths on which the past lived, though unable as yet to evaluate or define them explicitly", and so enriching "our intellectual patrimony by putting the total deposit little by little into currency and making it bear fruit."[83] This was Blondel's own account of doctrinal development, and might well have been censured, but was not.

Equally suspect might have been Blondel's chief work, *L'Action* (1893),[84] in which he sought to show that faith was a possibility already given in human experience. This was not an appeal to particular experiences, religious or otherwise, but to that which is common in all experience: a longing for something "uniquely necessary" but seemingly unobtainable. In every act we strive for something more than what we seek, something that transcends the act and its goal. This comes to view through reflection on action, the latter giving rise to thought and thought to the former's truth. And the truth, as articulated by Blondel, is the appearing of the beyond in the midst, the supernatural in the natural; of an infinite that shadows our finitude. This view, as Henri de Lubac was later to point out, might be thought to derive from Thomas Aquinas,[85] from the neoplatonic idea of a desire that moves us to return from whence we came.[86] It also looks forward to a sustained development in the work of Karl Rahner,[87]

but also—in its day—to that "folly" of "vital immanence" denounced in *Pascendi*, of a "subconscious" need for God,[88] "a kind of intuition of the heart which puts man in immediate contact with the reality of God, and infuses such a persuasion of God's existence and His action both within and without man as far to exceed any scientific conviction."[89] Blondel did well not to be thought one of the modernists or "pseudo-Mystics" by those on the hunt.

Mysticism

It is perhaps because the modernists became figures of fear for some and of hope for others—the threat or promise of church and world reconciled—that the intentionality of their inner life has been often questioned. Calling for a changed Catholicism their faith and honesty had to be either impugned or upheld. Alfred Loisy, who from 1904 onwards expected to be excommunicated, and did nothing to resist it when it was finally proclaimed in 1908, has often been interrogated to determine just when and in what manner he ceased to believe.[90] George Tyrrell's faith was suspect from the moment of his excommunication in October 1907, and his refusal to recant the articles that had earned such displeasure. Tyrrell could write of his old friend, Friedrich von Hügel, that he held nothing true, "but the sum total of nothings is sublime!"

> Christ was not merely ignorant but a *téte brulé* [sic]; Mary was not merely not a virgin, but an unbeliever and a rather unnatural mother; the Eucharist was a Pauline invention—yet he makes his daily visit to the Blessed Sacrament and for all I know tells his beads devoutly.[91]

Though a private, hyperbolic remark, this captures the mixture of scepticism and piety that both attracts and appalls in the modernists. For some it bespeaks their duplicity, while for others their insight into the core of Christianity, and the obstacles to saying it in a church so fearful of dissent and fracture—so wise in rooting out the heretic, as others might think.

Tyrrell and von Hügel first met in October 1897,[92] and though it was the view of the Wards—Wilfred, Josephine and Maisie[93]—and of Maude Petre[94] that von Hügel had endangered Tyrrell's faith and mind with tales of historical criticism, what von Hügel valued in Tyrrell was his spiritual discernment or mysticism.[95] In 1899, von Hügel expressed the view that Tyrrell was the English-speaking friend with whom he was "most completely at one."

> I have, of course, other gratefully cared for friends amongst them, but they are either not intellectually alive, or active largely on other subjects or in other directions, – at least more so than you are. The mystical *attrait* is a point that really speaks volumes, all round.[96]

Some fifteen years after Tyrrell's death, and despite the distance that had grown between them, von Hügel acknowledged the "force and completeness of that born mystic" who had so generously, and "for so many years", helped him in the writing of *The Mystical Element of Religion* (1908), "especially as to the mystical states, as to Aquinas and as to the form of the whole book".[97]

Both writers shared a common commitment to historical science, with Tyrrell supposedly inducted into its methods by von Hügel—and if von Hügel schooled Tyrrell, it was Monseigneur Louis Duchesne (1843-1922) who had schooled von Hügel, starting in 1884 when they met for the first time.[98] But von Hügel and Tyrrell were also committed to the finding—and being found by—the divine in and through the materiality of past and present. Like Loisy, they accepted the distinction between history and faith, though they were more arduous in seeking to bridge the two, and like Loisy they understood faith as the totality of Christian experience through time. But more than he, they trusted to that experience as testimony to an immanent transcendence. This was not the experience of individuals, but of the community that formed individuals, and so in them came to expression. Both resisted reducing such experience to a monism, whether materialist or idealist, but insisted on the distinction between physical and spiritual, while also acknowledging—as Tyrrell had it—that though this distinction was not a difference in the world it cannot be given other than in worldly terms. It is hard enough to render the world in the terms we draw from

it, and so even harder to render that which is not apart from, and yet distinct to, worldly life. "If the former knowledge is necessarily inadequate, the latter must be mysterious as well as inadequate; it must abound in seeming anomalies and paradoxes."[99] Here Tyrrell distinguishes between the world and God—who yet comes to us in the world—and between the reality of that divinely given and mediating world, constituted of physical, social and spiritual relationships, and the language in which it is spoken.

> Thus we learn to distinguish between God as He is given in our experience and as He is represented in the constructions of our religious understanding; even as we do between Nature which presses and acts upon us as a whole, and Nature as known to us only in part—merely from the surface in contact—through the enigmatical constructions and symbols of science.[100]

Von Hügel came to name his own philosophical position as one of "critical realism" precisely because, as with Tyrrell, he recognized that Christian faith is a response to the appearing of the transcendent in the material, in the facts of history, but that all such appearing has to be apprehended in a process that is at once interpretive and faltering.[101] If Duchesne had tutored von Hügel in history, it was Abbé Henri Huvelin (1838-1910) who nurtured his spirituality, and above all his sense that the transcendent comes to us, not in "out of the world" experiences, but in our experience of the world as such.[102]

It was also Huvelin who taught von Hügel to look for the mystical not outside the Church, but in and through ecclesial practice. This is why his great study of the "mystical element" is a study of a life in the Church—that of St Catherine of Genoa. But the Church, for someone like von Hügel, also gave rise to a critical resistance that seemed to belie the possibility of finding God therein. This was indeed the tragedy that both von Hügel and Tyrrell experienced: the Church that fostered their longing for the unknown source of all at the same time denied their intellect. It was as if they could not live without that which destroyed one of them, and troubled both. Huvelin counseled prayer. Von Hügel was not to think that he could lay hold of truth, nor that others would

understand the truth that he found, but it was truth that he was seeking, and doing so would be more important than maintaining orthodoxy. Conscience, conscientiousness and charity, come first.[103] It was thus that von Hügel sought to understand the intellectual movements that troubled the church of his day, to interpret them to one another, and to reconcile all with what he thought essential in the Christian vision. Thus in his life he sought to reconcile the three elements that he discerned in religion: the institutional, intellectual and spiritual; that which is given, that which receives, and the relationship that transcends both.[104]

Karl Rahner (1904-84) once observed that "the Christian of the future will be a mystic or he will not exist at all."[105] For Rahner, the mystical or spiritual is central to Christian life because central to the realization of the "Christian reality" in each individual.[106] And this will become ever more essential in the future—at least for such as European Christians—as the social support for Christian belief withers, and faith loses its former legitimation. "In such a situation the lonely responsibility of the individual in his decision of faith is necessary and required in a way much more radical than it was in former times." A "solitary courage" will be required, that "can exist only if it lives out of a wholly personal experience of God and his Spirit."[107]

In their different ways, both von Hügel and Tyrrell saw something of Rahner's future, as they too placed the spiritual at the heart of the Christian life, with intimations of its increasing importance for the religion that it both informed and was formed by. Tyrrell's last, posthumously published book, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads* (1909), is a tense and impassioned argument for Christ as mystic, and the Catholic Church as the mystical continuation of his life. "Through the mystical body, animated by the Spirit, we are brought into immediate contact with the ever present Christ. … The Church is not merely a society or school, but a mystery and sacrament; like the humanity of Christ of which it is an extension."[108] But the dying Tyrrell had been expelled from this body, denied its sacrament. As a modernist, he was without the solace and legitimation of the Church, dependent on his own inner faith and that of his friends. In this sense he was already the Christian that Rahner foresaw, requiring "the lonely courage analogous to that of the first martyrs of the first century of

Christianity, the courage for a spiritual decision of faith, drawing its strength from itself and not needing to be supported by public agreement, particularly since even the Church's public opinion does not so much sustain the individual in his decision of faith, but is itself sustained by the latter."[109] This then might be the legacy of the modernists, that they have already lived the crisis that is to come; that is perhaps always to come. For even now is the Church not—in the words of George Tyrrell—"hastening to an *impasse*—to one of those extremities which are God's opportunities?"[110]

Notes

[1] Fergus Kerr, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians: From Neoscholasticism to Nuptial Mysticism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).

[2] Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris* (1879), ¶ 27 & 28.

[3] Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris*, ¶ 29.

[4] Pius X, *Encyclical Letter ("*Pascendi Gregis*") of our most Holy Lord Pius X by Divine Providence Pope on the Doctrines of the Modernists* (London: Burns & Oates, 1907) p. 53 (§ 42). Hereafter referred to as *Pascendi*.

[5] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 57 (§ 45).

[6] George Tyrrell to Friedrich von Hügel, 6 December 1897; quoted in M. D. Petre, *Autobiography and Life of George Tyrrell*, 2 vols (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), vol. 2, p. 45.

[7] Nicholas Sagovsky, *"On God's Side": A Life of George Tyrrell* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), p. 223.

[8] See Alec R. Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), pp. 17-18; and Gabriel Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence: A Study in Catholic Modernism and Integralism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1980), Appendix 1 (pp. 232-34). For Vidler's earlier study of modernism see *The Modernist Movement in the Roman Catholic Church: Its Origins and Outcome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934).

[9] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 48 (§ 39).

[10] Pius X, *Pascendi*, pp. 51-53 (§§ 40, 41).

[11] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 55 (§ 43).

[12] Pius X, *Pascendi*, pp. 65-66 (§ 55).

[13] The oath is appended to Kerr's *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, pp. 223-25.

[14] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 48 (§ 39).

[15] Alfred Loisy, *Simples réflexions sur le décret du saint-office Lamentabili sane exitu et sur l'encyclique Pascendi dominici gregis* (Ceffonds: Chez l'auteur, 1908).

[16] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 6 (§ 4). It would seem that the first use of "modernism" in the pejorative sense deployed by the encyclical was in a pastoral letter issued by a group of Italian bishops in December 1905. See Owen Chadwick, *A History of the*

Popes 1830-1914 (The Oxford History of the Christian Church; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), p. 354.

[17] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 7 (§ 5).

[18] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 8 (§ 7).

[19] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 9 (§ 8).

[20] Pius X, *Pascendi*, pp. 10-11 (§ 9).

[21] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 13-14 (§ 12).

[22] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 35 (§ 28).

[23] Pius X, *Pascendi*, pp. 50-51 (§ 39).

[24] Kerr, *Twentieth Century Catholic Theologians*, p. 224.

[25] Kerr, *Twentieth Century Catholic Theologians*, p. 223.

[26] Admittedly there were few American modernists; perhaps only William L. Sullivan (1872-1935). See further John Ratté, *Three Modernists: Alfred Loisy, George Tyrrell, William L. Sullivan* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1968). North America gave rise to its own heresy, "Americanism", condemned by Leo XII in *Testem benevolentiae nostrae* (1899). There is no room in the Church for republican or democratic values, for the license granted the citizen in a civil state. The Church enjoys the liberty of Christ. See further Thomas T. McAvoy, *The Great Crisis in American Catholic History 1895-1900* (Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1957).

[27] For the French context, discussed in relation to university education, see George H. Tavard, "Blondel's *Action* and the Problem of the University" in *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Historical Context*, edited by Darrell Jodock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), pp. 142-68. For the Italian story see in the same book, Gary Lease, "Vatican Foreign Policy and the Origins of Modernism", pp. 31-55; and for the European context more generally, Paul Misner, "Catholic Modernism: The Ecclesial Setting", pp. 56-87. Both Lease and Misner show how modernism was harbingered by a more extended anti-modernism, that Lease runs from 1870-1930 (p. 55). See also Owen Chadwick, *The Popes and European Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981).

[28] Lease, "Vatican Foreign Policy and the Origins of Modernism", p. 42.

[29] Wilfred Ward quoted in Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards and the Transition*, 2 vols (London: Sheed & Ward, 1934-37), vol. 2: Insurrection versus Resurrection, p. 322.

[30] Thomas Michael Loome worries away at finding the correct terms in his *Liberal Catholicism, Reform Catholicism, Modernism: A Contribution to a New Orientation in Modernist Research* (Tübingen Theologische Studien 14; Mainz: Mathias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1979).

[31] For an account of Tyrrell's death see Sagovsky, *"On God's Side"*, ch. 15.

[32] Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, pp. 492-93.

[33] On von Hügel see further Michael de la Bedoyere, *The Life of Baron von Hügel* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1951) and John J. Heaney, *The Modernist Crisis: Von Hügel* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968).

[34] For a sense of this febrile atmosphere see Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, ch. 15 ("A Time of Trial"). For the European context more generally see Chadwick, *A History of the Popes*, pp. 355-59, which discusses Pius's chief of secret police (Under-Secretary of State), Monsignor Umberto Benigni.

[35] Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, p. 189.

[36] Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 1: The Nineteenth Century, ch. 7 ("Finding a Life Work").

[37] See respectively, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement* (London: Macmillan, 1889); *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival* (London: Macmillan, 1893); *The Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman*, 2 vols (London: Longmans & Co., 1898); and *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, 2 vols (London: Longmans & Co., 1912). See also Sheridan Gilley, "Ward, William George (1812–1882)," in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, edited by H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).

[38] See further Paschal Scotti, *Out of Due Time: Wilfred Ward and the Dublin Review* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2006).

[39] Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 1, p. 134.

[40] Inevitably Mrs Wilfred Ward was compared with the far more successful Mrs Humphry Ward, whose *Robert Elsmere* (1888)—an Anglican priest who loses his faith to the higher criticism—had been a best seller in both Britain and America. G. K. Chesterton suggested a comic opera in which the two Wards would perform a duet

with the refrain, "We write the knobby novels of the day." Cited in Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, p. 110.

[41] Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists*, p. 154.

[42] Modernism was explored in various contemporary and near-contemporary novels, such as William L. Sullivan's *The Priest: A Tale of Modernism in New England* (1911), Jean Nesmy's *La Lumière de la Maison* (1909) and Roger Martin du Gard's *Jean Barois* (1913), which portrays the French liberal Catholic Marcel Hébert, and Paul Bourget's *Le Démon de Midi* (1914)—"a salad of Modernism and of adultery" (Albert Houtin to Loisy; cited in Vidler, *A Variety*, p. 154). Other French novels were Albert Autin's *L'Anathème* (1921) and Joseph Malègue's anti-modernist, *Augustin ou le Maître est là* (1933). Ireland produced Gerald O'Donovan's *Father Ralph* (1913).

[43] Indeed, according to Maisie, Wilfred did write some parts of the novel. See *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, p. 240.

[44] On Lamennais see Bernard Reardon, *Liberalism and Tradition: Aspects of Catholic Thought in Nineteenth Century France* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), pp. 18-19, 62-112; and Chadwick, *A History of the Popes*, pp. 12-31. *Out of Due Time* was not the only novel to retell Lamennais' story. There was Emile Zola's *Rome* (1895-96), the second of his *Les Trois Villes* trilogy, and Antonio Fogazzaro's *Il Santo* (1905), which also told the story of a liberal who misguidedly appeals to the pope. It was a sensation, and immediately translated into English—*The Saint*, translated by M. Prichard-Agnetti (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1906)—but in the same year also placed on the Index of Forbidden Books (5 April).

[45] It seems that the papal audience would have led Lamennais and his friends to have hoped for the best. See Chadwick, *A History of the Popes*, pp. 21-22.

[46] Lamennais initially submitted to Gregory XVI's judgement. But in 1834 the pope also condemned—in the encyclical *Singulari nos* (25 June)—Lamennais' *Les Paroles d'un Croyant* (*Words of a Believer*) itself published that year. It was this that led him to finally withdraw from active engagement in the Church. In the following years he produced several significant works, the most notable of which was his 3 volume *Esquisse d'une Philosophie* (1840).

[47] There was no modernist journal in Britain, though on the continent there were several that promoted historical biblical criticism, such as the *Revue biblique* and

L'Enseignement biblique. In 1896 Loisy became editor of the *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuse*. In 1898 Italy saw the start of *Cultura sociale* and in 1901 *Studi religiosi*. All of these were favourable to modernism.

[48] Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, p. 240.

[49] Quoted in Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, pp. 239-40.

[50] See Mrs Wilfred Ward, *Out of Due Time* (London: Longmans & Co., 1906), p. 5; and Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, p. 200.

[51] Mrs Wilfred Ward, *Out of Due Time*, pp. 39-40. Sutcliffe wants the Church "to understand that there was a world of thought, and of thinkers, almost unknown to them as they sat at home at ease in faith and plenty. He wanted them to understand how the usual text-books used by Catholics in this country, were not only inadequate to express the great truths of religion, but were almost unintelligible to those who had been educated in the language of a new civilization. Greek may be a finer language than English, but it is not usually of so much use in dealing with the inhabitants of the British Isles" (p. 46).

[52] Mrs Wilfred Ward, *Out of Due Time*, p.41.

[53] Mrs Wilfred Ward, *Out of Due Time*, p.38.

[54] In 1896 von Hügel wrote to William Sanday (1843-1920) requesting that he write an article on Loisy. "If it could take the form of a cordial welcome, expressed by yourself but as, you were sure, shared by numerous Anglican scholars and savants, and of gladness at seeing the Roman Church resuming its best traditions in this matter, and of certainty as to the importance of the work being able to be continued and finished—or some such thoroughly friendly inter-confessional form, – you wd. do much good, I am very sure." Von Hügel to Sanday, 1 August 1896. The article, on "The Work of Abbé Loisy", duly appeared in *The Guardian* (26 August 1896).

[55] See Reardon, *Liberalism and Tradition*, p. 71.

[56] Mrs Wilfred Ward, *Out of Due Time*, p. 52.

[57] Mrs Wilfred Ward, *Out of Due Time*, p. 101.

[58] Mrs Wilfred Ward, *Out of Due Time*, p. 175.

[59] See David Hume's *Natural History of Religion* (1757).

[60] For this story see Hans Frei, *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974).

[61] Alfred Loisy, *Études bibliques*, third edition (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1903); cited in *Roman Catholic Modernism*, edited and introduced by Bernard Reardon (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1970), p. 20. The first edition of *Études bibliques* had been published in 1894, the second in 1901.

[62] Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus* (1983), ¶ 20.

[63] Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus*, ¶ 21.

[64] Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus*, ¶ 22.

[65] For a detailed account of these arguments see Lawrence F. Barmann, *Baron Friedrich von Hügel and the Modernist Crisis in England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), ch. 3 (pp. 38-53).

[66] George Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1909), p. 92. Alfred Loisy, *L'Évangile et l'Église* (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1902).

[67] Adolf von Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1900); ET *What is Christianity?*, translated by T. B. Saunders (London: Williams & Norgate, 1904).

[68] John Henry Newman, *An Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine* (London: James Toovey, 1845); revised edition (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1878). For Loisy on Newman see his *Memoires pour servir à la l'histoire religieuse de notre temps*, 3 vols (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1930-1), vol. 2, pp. 560 f; and for Tyrrell's views see *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, ch. 5 (pp. 29-34).

[69] Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 29. For Wilfred's fears see Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, pp. 559-62. On Newman's relation to modernism see further *John Henry Newman and Modernism*, edited by Arthur Hilary Jenkins (Internationale Cardinal-Newman-Studien 14; Sigmaringendorf: Glock und Lutz, 1990).

[70] Reardon, *Roman Catholic Modernism*, p. 32.

[71] "Revelation is realized in man, but it is the work of God in him, with him and by him." Alfred Loisy, *Autour d'un petit livre* (Paris: Alphonse Picard et fils, 1903), p. 197.

[72] For 21st century attempts see Graham Gould and Richard A. Burridge, *Jesus Now and Then* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 2004); Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays (eds), *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage* (Grand Rapids MI:

Eerdmans, 2008); and Joseph Ratzinger (Benedict XVI), *Jesus of Nazareth* (New York: Doubleday, 2007).

[73] Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 44.

[74] This point is not exactly Tyrrell's, since he supposed his own account of Jesus to be more than just his own reflection. Presenting what he deemed to be the "assured results of criticism" (p. xv) he argued for Jesus as—in Albert Schweitzer's words (when noting Tyrrell's indebtedness to his work)—an "ethical Apocalyptist who by his very nature was not Protestant but Catholic." Albert Schweitzer, *My Life and Thought: An Autobiography*, translated by C. T. Campion (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1933), p. 64.

[75] The centrality of historical criticism was attested, contra *Pascendi*, in the anonymously published *Il Programma dei modernisti* (1907): "So far from our philosophy dictating our critical method, it is the critical method that has, of its own accord, forced us to a very tentative and uncertain formulation of various philosophical conclusions, or better still, to a clearer exposition of certain ways of thinking to which Catholic apologetic has never been wholly a stranger" (quoted in Reardon, *Roman Catholic Modernism*, p. 212). The programme was the work of Ernesto Buonaiutti (1881-1946), whose involvement in modernism—"a youthful mistake"—he described in his autobiography, *Il Pellegrino di Roma* (1945).

[76] See Bernard Reardon, *Roman Catholic Modernism*, pp. 52-59.

[77] See Alec Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists*, p. 79.

[78] Robert Dell to A. L. Lilley, 31 March 1908; cited in Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists*, pp. 81-82.

[79] Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists*, p. 82.

[80] See Maurice Blondel, "Histoire et dogme: les lacunes philosophiques de l'exégèse moderne", *La Quinzaine* (January-February1904); ET in *The Letter on Apologetics and History and Dogma*, translated by Alexander Dru and Illtyd Trethowan (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995 [1964]). "What I am criticizing is the thesis of the water-tight compartment between history and dogma, and of the incommensurability of assertions of faith and of truths of fact; and still more, of course, the thesis of an opposition between them which results in double-thinking" ("History and Dogma", p. 258n1). For von Hügel's response see "Du Christ eternal et de nos christologies successives", *La Quinzane* (1 June 1904). See further Barmann,

Baron Friedrich von Hügel, pp. 120-23; and, more extensively, Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, ch. 4.

[81] Blondel, "History and Dogma", pp. 226-31.

[82] Blondel, "History and Dogma", p. 237.

[83] Blondel, "History and Dogma", p. 267.

[84] Maurice Blondel, *L'Action: essai d'une critique de la vie et d'une science de la pratique* (Paris: Alcan, 1893); ET *Action: Essay on a Critique of Life and a Science of Practice*, translated by Oliva Blanchette (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2007).

[85] "All knowers know God implicitly in all they know" (Thomas Aquinas, *De Veritate*, q. 22, a. 2, ad 1); "All things, desiring their own perfection desire God himself" (Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, prima pars, q. 6, a. 1, ad 2).

[86] Henri de Lubac, *Sur les chemins de Dieu* (Paris: Aubier, 1956); ET *The Discovery of God*, translated by Alexander Dru (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996 [1960]). "[T]he idea of God is mysteriously present in us from the beginning, prior to our concepts, although beyond our grasp without their help, and prior to all our argumentation, in spite of being logically unjustifiable without them: it is the inspiration, the motive power and justification of them all" (p. 39). See Kerr, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, p. 78.

[87] See Karl Rahner's study in Thomistic theology, *Spirit in the World*, translated by William Dych (London: Sheed & Ward, 1968 [1957]). "[M]an encounters himself when he finds himself in the world and when he asks about God; and when he asks about his essence, he always finds himself already in the world and on the way to God. He is both these at once, and cannot be one without the other" (p. 406).

[88] Pius X, *Pascendi*, pp. 8-9 (§§ 7-8).

[89] Pius X, *Pascendi*, p. 16 (§ 14).

[90] See Alec Vidler, "The Enigma Resolved?" in *A Variety of Catholic Modernists*, pp. 40-62.

[91] George Tyrrell to A. L. Lilley, 14 August 1908; cited in Vidler, *A Variety of Catholic Modernists*, pp. 117-18.

[92] Barmann, *Friedrich von Hügel*, p. 140.

[93] "During these years [Tyrrell's] friendship with Baron von Hügel was steadily growing. This friendship my mother [Josephine Ward] always maintained was his

undoing. … [T]he Baron, instead of trying to develop what was there, tried to turn Tyrrell into something quite unlike himself. He made him learn German and read modern German philosophy. He introduced him to Loisy and Biblical criticism. And the results were disastrous." Maisie Ward, *The Wilfred Wards*, vol. 2, p. 187; see also p. 499. Ward's sometimes seemingly bitchy account leaves us in doubt as to what Family Ward thought of the Baron: "The Baron had a unique power of opening windows on to almost infinite vistas, but he had no power whatever of gauging another man's mind. He had certain ideals of what needed doing for the Church, and he valued all his friends primarily for their utility to this end" (p. 187). The Baron was a user, and Tyrrell abused, but also vulnerable, and possibly inviting, because of lacking a chin. "It seems absurd to feel, as I often did, that had Fr Tyrrell's chin been different the course of events would have been changed or at least modified. The almost total absence of this feature surely expressed or at least symbolized a weakness that one quickly realized. He reflected almost like a looking-glass the ideas of a stronger personality in his company." Maisie Ward, *Unfinished Business* (London, 1964), p. 53. This estimation of Tyrrell, and of his relationship to von Hügel, is reflected in the character of Fr Colnes in *Out of Due Time*. Fr Colnes is too much taken with the Count, reads too much in the critical literature, and temporarily flees his parish. Happily he is later brought to his senses. "That he was very sensitive could easily be seen from a first glance at the pale, thin features and transparent eyelids and nostrils. His eyes were pale too, and his large mouth was weak. Some conditions of nerves sharpen perceptions, and Fr Colnes knew what people felt towards him almost as acutely as if he had been a dog" (*Out of Due Time*, p. 14).

[94] Maude Petre, *Von Hügel and Tyrrell: The Story of a Friendship* (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1937), pp. 118-20.

[95] See Lawrence Barmann, "The Modernist as Mystic" in *Catholicism Contending with Modernity: Roman Catholic Modernism and Anti-Modernism in Historical Context*, edited by Darrell Jodock (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 215-47 (p. 231).

[96] Von Hügel to Tyrrell, 17 November 1899; cited in Barmann, "The Modernist as Mystic", p. 232. See also Friedrich von Hügel, "Father Tyrrell: Some Memorials of the Last Twelve Years of His Life", *The Hibbert Journal*, 8 (1910).

[97] Friedrich von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and Her Friends*, 2 vols, second edition (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1961 [1923]), vol. 1, p. vii. Von Hügel's tribute had been less fulsome in the first edition (1908), where he acknowledged the many "insights into mysticism" of two of Tyrrell's books, *Hard Sayings* (1898) and *Faith of the Millions* (1901). But at the time Tyrrell's name was not to be invoked lightly if one wished to evade the "organized company of delators" (von Hügel to Maude Petre, 3 July 1906; cited in Barmann, "The Modernist as Mystic", p. 231n47). Tyrrell had in fact corrected the proofs, and suggested changes.

[98] See Barmann, "The Modernist as Mystic", p. 223.

[99] George Tyrrell, *Lex Orandi or Prayer and Creed* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1907), p. 68.

[100] Tyrrell, *Lex Orandi*, p. 70. Tyrrell's distinctions are of course those of Thomas Aquinas, and he appended a note on "The Meaning of 'Analogous'" (pp. 80-83) to his chapter on "Belief in God" (pp. 71-80). Tyrrell well understood that the difference between God and world is a different difference from those between things in the world, even the difference between object and idea. "Man cannot deal practically with what the heart of man has never conceived, with what is neither the self nor the non-self; with what is as distinct from him as the latter, yet quite differently distinct; as close to him as the former, yet quite differently close; with a relation that is necessarily *sui generis* and unknown to finite experience; he cannot deal with the Absolute in its absoluteness" (p. 77).

[101] Von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. 1, p. xvi.

[102] Barmann, "The Modernist as Mystic", p. 223.

[103] See Barmann, "The Modernist as Mystic", pp. 226-27.

[104] Von Hügel, *The Mystical Element of Religion*, vol. 1, p. 60. See further Daly, *Transcendence and Immanence*, ch. 6.

[105] Karl Rahner, "The Spirituality of the Church of the Future", *Theological Investigations* (London: Longman, Darton & Todd, 1981) vol. 20, 143-153 (p. 149). Ellen Leonard espies a close resemblance between Tyrrell's vision and that of Karl Rahner in *The Shape of the Church to Come*, translated and introduced by Edward Quinn (London: SPCK, 1974 [1972]). See Leonard, *George Tyrrell*, p. 137.

[106] Rahner, "The Spirituality of the Church of the Future", p. 143.

[107] Rahner, "The Spirituality of the Church of the Future", p. 149.

[108] Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 275.

[109] Rahner, "The Spirituality of the Church of the Future", p. 149.

[110] Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, p. 282.